

NATIONALISM AND AFTER

Books by Prof. E. H. Carr

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SINCE THE PEACE TREATIES

MICHAEL BAKUNIN

THE TWENTY YEARS' CRISIS, 1919-1939

CONDITIONS OF PEACE

NATIONALISM AND AFTER

BY

EDWARD HALLETT CARR

PROFESSOR OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICS
IN THE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF WALES

PROPERTY OF
CARNEGIE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
LIBRARY

LONDON
MACMILLAN & CO. LTD

1945

320.15
C31
cap. 4

COPYRIGHT

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
BY R. & R. CLARK, LIMITED, EDINBURGH

CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. THE CLIMAX OF NATIONALISM . . .	1
The First Period	2
The Second Period	6
The Third Period	17
The Climax	26
A Fourth Period ?	34
II. THE PROSPECTS OF INTERNATIONALISM . . .	38
Individual and Nation	38
Power in the International Order . . .	51
Principles and Purposes	60
POSTSCRIPT	71

"Nationality does not aim either at liberty or prosperity, both of which it sacrifices to the imperative necessity of making the nation the mould and measure of the state. Its course will be marked with material as well as moral ruin."

ACTON (1862)

THE CLIMAX OF NATIONALISM

It is commonly assumed that nations in the modern sense are the product of the disruption of the international — or rather pre-international — order of mediaeval Christendom, and that they represent the projection on a collective national plane of the Renaissance spirit of adventurous and self-assertive individualism. It is further assumed that international relations in the contemporary sense of the term date from the 16th and 17th centuries, when international wars recognizably similar to those of more recent times began to be waged and modern international law first took shape. These assumptions are broadly correct. But the third assumption frequently made that the fundamental character of nations and the type of problem presented by relations between them have remained more or less unchanged through the past three or four centuries is less well founded. The modern history of international relations divides into three partly overlapping periods, marked by widely differing views of the nation as a political entity.¹ The first was

¹ The vocabulary of this subject is notoriously full of pitfalls. Since the 16th or 17th century "nation" with its equivalents in other languages has been the most natural word throughout western Europe for the major political unit: this explains the paucity of derivatives from the word "state" and its equivalents and the use in their place of words like "national" and "nationalization". The realms of the Habsburgs and Romanovs were, however, not nations but empires; and the colourless legal word "state" covered both them and the nations of western Europe, as well as the numerous small German and Italian states. In central and eastern Europe the word "nation" and its equivalents meant a racial or linguistic group and had no political significance before the 19th century, when the doctrine gradually became prevalent that such groups had a right to political independence and statehood ("national self-determina-

terminated by the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars, having the Congress of Vienna as its tail-piece and swan-song ; the second was essentially the product of the French Revolution and, though its foundations were heavily undermined from 1870 onwards, lasted on till the catastrophe of 1914, with the Versailles settlement as its belated epilogue ; the third period, whose main features first began to take shape after 1870, reached its culmination between 1914 and 1939. It is still perhaps too soon to say whether we are already passing into a fourth period, as sharply differentiated in character from the third as was the third from its predecessors.

The First Period

The first period begins with the gradual dissolution of the mediaeval unity of empire and church and the establishment of the national state and the national church. In the new national unit it was normally the secular arm which, relying on the principle *cuius regio, eius religio*, emerged predominant ; but there was nothing anomalous in a bishop or prince of the church exercising territorial sovereignty. The essential characteristic of the period was the identification of the nation with the person of the sovereign. Luther regarded " the bishops and princes " as constituting the German nation. Louis XIV thought that the French nation " resided wholly in the person of the King ". De Maistre, an early 19th-century throw-back to the previous period, argued that the nation consisted of " the ruler and

tion "). In the same way it has lately become customary to speak of Scottish, Welsh or Indian nationalism, though more rarely of the Scottish, Welsh or Indian nations. The terminology is further complicated by the usage of the United States, where " nation " is reserved for the major unit and " states " are its components and have no international standing ; from the American point of view it would have made nonsense to call the League of Nations a " League of States ".

THE CLIMAX OF NATIONALISM

the nobility".¹ International relations were relations between kings and princes; and matrimonial alliances were a regular instrument of diplomacy. The behaviour of the 17th- and 18th-century sovereigns conformed perfectly to this prescription. The absolute power of the monarch at home might be contested. Even Frederick the Great described himself as the "first servant" of his state. But nobody questioned that in international relations with other monarchs he spoke as one having authority over his "subjects" and "possessions"; and these could be freely disposed of for personal or dynastic reasons. The doctrine of sovereignty made sense so long as this authority remained real and "our sovereign lord the king" had not yet become a ceremonial phrase.

These were the auspices under which international law was born. It was primarily a set of rules governing the mutual relations of individuals in their capacity as rulers. A treaty was a contract concluded between sovereigns — a form not yet extinct; and the personal good faith of the sovereign was the guarantee of its execution. Grotius in the concluding chapter of *De Jure Belli ac Pacis* appealed to "the duty of kings to cherish good faith scrupulously, first for conscience' sake, and then also for the sake of the reputation by which the authority of the royal power is supported". The "international of monarchs", all speak-

¹ These and other relevant quotations will be found in F. Hertz, *Nationality in History and Politics*, pp. 274-5, 314, 374. In much of eastern Europe the restriction of the nation to the upper classes still held good in the 19th century. "It was said of a Croat landowner of the 19th century that he would sooner have regarded his horse than his peasant as a member of the Croat nation" (*Nationalism, A Report by a Study Group of the Royal Institute of International Affairs*, p. 96). In the middle of the 19th century, and even later, the distance which separated the Polish gentry from the Polish-speaking peasantry was still so great that the latter did not as a rule look on themselves as part of the Polish nation.

ing a common language, owning a common tradition, and conscious of a common interest in maintaining the submissiveness of their subjects, was not wholly a fiction, and secured at any rate formal recognition of a common standard of values. A sense of obligation deriving from the unity of Christendom and the validity of natural law — *rex non debet sub homine, sed sub Deo ac lege*, in Bracton's formula — survived in the secular trappings of the Enlightenment. Claiming the sanctity of law as the basis of their own authority, they could not afford openly and flagrantly to flout it in their relations with one another. It was not a 17th- or 18th-century autocrat, but a 19th-century American democrat, who coined the slogan "My country, right or wrong".

In this scheme of things a common analogy was drawn between the wars of monarchs and the actions at law of private citizens. As Grotius explicitly argues, the causes for which action at law may justly be sustained are those which make it just to wage war. A sovereign waging war no more desired to inflict injury or loss on the subjects of his enemy than a citizen going to law desires to inflict them on the servants of his adversary. They might indeed, and commonly did, suffer from the rapacity and savagery of his pressed or hired soldiers; but his own subjects were also not immune from these hazards. A large part of the early history of international law consists of the building up of rules to protect the property and commerce of non-combatants. Civilians were in effect not parties to the quarrel. The 18th century witnessed many wars; but in respect of the freedom and friendliness of intercourse between the educated classes in the principal European countries, with French as a recognized common language, it was the most "international" period of modern history, and civilians could pass to and fro and transact their business freely with one another while their respective sovereigns were at war.

THE CLIMAX OF NATIONALISM

The conception of international relations from which these rules and habits proceeded is obviously something quite different from that prevailing in our own time.

Equally characteristic were the national economic policies of the period, to which the name "mercantilism" was afterwards given. The aim of mercantilism, both in its domestic and in its external policies, was not to promote the welfare of the community and its members, but to augment the power of the state, of which the sovereign was the embodiment. Trade was stimulated because it brought wealth to the coffers of the state; and wealth was the source of power, or more specifically of fitness for war. As Colbert, the most famous and consistent exponent of the system, put it, "trade is the source of finance, and finance is the vital nerve of war".¹ Internally, mercantilism sought to break down the economic particularism, the local markets and restrictive regulations, which underlay the uniformity of the mediaeval order, to make the state the economic unit and to assert its undivided authority in matters of trade and manufacture throughout its territory. Externally, it sought to promote the wealth and therefore the power of the state in relation to other states. Wealth, conceived in its simplest form as bullion, was brought in by exports; and since, in the static conception of society prevailing in this period, export markets were a fixed quantity not susceptible of increase as a whole, the only way for a nation to expand its markets and therefore its wealth was to capture them from some other nation, if necessary by waging a "trade war". War thus became an instrument of mercantilist policy as well as its ultimate end. It is a mistake to contrast mercantilism with *laissez-faire* as if the one were directed to national, the other to individual,

¹ Quoted in E. F. Hecksher, *Mercantilism*, ii, 17. The "finance" referred to is public finance.

ends. Both were directed to national ends ; the difference between them related to a difference in the conception of the nation. Mercantilism was the economic policy of a period which identified the interest of the nation with the interest of its rulers. Its aim, as defined by its most authoritative historian, was "wealth for the nation, but wealth from which the majority of the people must be excluded".¹

The Second Period

The second period, which issued from the turmoil of the Napoleonic Wars and ended in 1914, is generally accounted the most orderly and enviable of modern international relations. Its success depended on a remarkable series of compromises which made it in some respects the natural heir, in others the antithesis, of the earlier period. Looked at in one way, it succeeded in delicately balancing the forces of "nationalism" and "internationalism"; for it established an international order or framework strong enough to permit of a striking extension and intensification of national feeling without disruption on any wide scale of regular and peaceful international relations. Put in another way, it might be said that, while in the previous period political and economic power had marched hand in hand to build up the national political unit and to substitute a single national economy for a conglomeration of local economies, in the 19th century a compromise was struck between political and economic power so that each could develop on its own lines. Politically, therefore, national forces were more and more successful throughout the 19th century in asserting the claim of the nation to statehood, whether through a coalescence or through a break-up of existing units. Economically, on the other hand, inter-

¹ E. F. Heckscher, *Mercantilism*, ii, 166.

THE CLIMAX OF NATIONALISM

national forces carried a stage further the process inaugurated in the previous period by transforming a multiplicity of national economies into a single world economy. From yet a third angle the system might be seen as a compromise between the popular and democratic appeal of political nationalism and the esoteric and autocratic management of the international economic mechanism. The collapse of these compromises, and the revelation of the weaknesses and unrealities that lay behind them, marked the concluding stages of the second period. The failure since 1914 to establish any new compromise capable of reconciling the forces of nationalism and internationalism is the essence of the contemporary crisis.

The founder of modern nationalism as it began to take shape in the 19th century was Rousseau, who, rejecting the embodiment of the nation in the personal sovereign or the ruling class, boldly identified "nation" and "people"; and this identification became a fundamental principle both of the French and of the American revolutions. It is true that the "people" in this terminology did not mean those who came to be known to a later epoch as the "workers" or the "common people". The Jacobin constitution, which would have substituted manhood suffrage for the substantial property qualification of the National Convention, was never operative.¹ Babeuf went to the guillotine; and the solid and respectable middle class, which made up the "Third Estate", retained through a large part of the 19th century a rooted fear and mistrust of the masses.

¹ "The philosophers and political writers of the 18th century were unanimously — not excepting Rousseau — against the idea of establishing in France a democracy as we understand it — the rule of universal suffrage; and the French had been still further encouraged to repudiate the idea of such a democracy by the example of the American English who had established in their republican states a property-owners' suffrage" (A. Aulard, *The French Revolution*, English trans., p. 179).

Nevertheless this middle-class nationalism had in it from the first a democratic and potentially popular flavour which was wholly foreign to the 18th century. The distance in this respect between Frederick the Great and Napoleon, two ambitious and unscrupulous military conquerors separated in time by less than half a century, is enormous. Frederick the Great still belonged to the age of legitimate monarchy, treated his subjects as instruments of his ambition, despised his native language and culture and regarded Prussia not as a national entity but as his family domain. Napoleon, by posing as the champion and mandatory of the emancipated French nation, made himself the chief missionary of modern nationalism. He was in many senses the first "popular" dictator. Intellectually the transition from Frederick to Napoleon was paralleled by the transition from Gibbon to Burke, or from Goethe and Lessing to Herder and Schiller; the cosmopolitanism of the Enlightenment was replaced by the nationalism of the Romantic movement. The implications of the change were far-reaching. The nation in its new and popular connotation had come to stay. International relations were henceforth to be governed not by the personal interests, ambitions and emotions of the monarch, but by the collective interests, ambitions and emotions of the nation.

The "democratization" ¹ of nationalism imparted to it a new and disturbing emotional fervour. With the disappearance of the absolute monarch the personification of the nation became a necessary convenience in international

¹ Here again terminology becomes disputable. The "liberal democracy" or "*bourgeois* democracy" of the 19th century is often distinguished from modern "social democracy" or "mass democracy". Some thinkers would regard the restricted democracy of the 19th century as liberal but not democratic, and reserve the term democracy for the modern egalitarian form; others would argue that, whereas liberalism is essential to democratic forms of government, socialism has not yet been proved compatible with them.

relations and international law. But it was far more than a convenient abstraction. The idea of the personality and character of the nation acquired a profound psychological significance. Writers like Mazzini thought and argued about nations exactly as if they were sublimated individuals. Even to-day people are still capable, especially in English-speaking countries, of feeling a keen emotional excitement over the rights or wrongs of "Patagonia" or "Ruritania" without the slightest knowledge or understanding of the highly complex entities behind these abstractions. The 19th century was passionately devoted to individualism and to democracy as it was then understood; and nationalism seemed a natural corollary of both. What is not so clear is why the rugged individualism of nations should have been regarded as less self-assertive and menacing to peace than the rugged individualism of monarchs, why nations should have been expected to display the princely qualities of forbearance and a sense of honour, but not the equally princely qualities of aggressiveness and greed, why nationalism should have been regarded as a promising stepping-stone to internationalism, and why, finally, it was rarely perceived that nationalism is not so much the apogee of individualism and of democracy as a denial of them. But these questions were seldom asked. A generation reared in the doctrine of a natural harmony of interest between individuals was readily persuaded of a harmony of interest between personified nations. And, after all, the really puzzling question is not why people in the 19th century thought as they did, but why, in spite of theoretical arguments which seems so cogent to the present generation, the dynamite of nationalism did not produce its catastrophic explosion for a full century after the downfall of Napoleon, so that this second period of modern international relations looks to-day like an idyllic interlude between the turbulent first period of warring monarchies and the

contemporary, and apparently still more turbulent, period of warring nations.

The first answer would appear to be that the framework of liberal democracy within which 19th-century nationalism, at any rate down to 1870, chiefly operated had certain common standards of universal validity which, though different from those of the 18th century, were not less effective in upholding a measure of international solidarity. The rights of nations were consciously derived from, and subordinated to, the rights of man which were in their very essence both individual and universal. A nation which did not respect the rights of its own subjects or of other nations denied its own essential character. Moreover, loyalty to this common standard was reinforced by a tangible solidarity of interest. The ruling middle classes who were the bearers of the 19th-century nationalism entertained almost everywhere throughout the middle years of the century a lively fear of revolution from below. The rights of property were scarcely less sacrosanct than the rights of man and the functions of the *bourgeois* democratic state — the “night-watchman state” in Lassalle’s sarcastic phrase — were largely concerned with its protection. Property, sometimes described as “a stake in the country”, was a condition of political rights and — it might be said without much exaggeration — of full membership of the nation: the worker had, in this sense, no fatherland. When Marx appealed to the workers of the world to unite, he was fully conscious of the strength which unity gave to his adversaries. The 19th-century *bourgeoisie* of the propertied classes in western Europe formed a coherent entity, trained to the management both of public and of business affairs (the modern English public school, like the French *lycée*, dates from this period), and united by ties of common ideals and common interests. In their competent hands the

democratized nation was still proof for many years to come against the disruptive turbulence of popular nationalism.

The second explanation of the pacific character of 19th-century nationalism goes deeper and is fundamental to the whole 19th century. What happened after 1815, though through no particular merit of the peace-makers of Vienna,¹ was nothing less than the gradual development of a new kind of economic order which, by making possible a phenomenal increase of production and population, offered to the newly enfranchised nations of Europe the opportunity to expand and spread their material civilization all over the world, and, by concentrating the direction of this world economic order in one great capital city, created an international — or, more accurately, supra-national — framework strong enough to contain with safety and without serious embarrassment the heady wine of the new nationalism. There was thus a real foundation for the Cobdenite view of international trade as a guarantee of international peace. Not only were the middle-class governments of the western nations united by a common respect for the rights of property and for the principle of non-interference in the management of a world economy which was so triumphantly advancing the wealth and authority of the middle classes, but even Habsburg and Romanov relicts of 18th-century autocracy did not disdain the financial crumbs that fell from prosperous *bourgeois* tables and became humble hangers-on of the *bourgeois* economic order.

This new international economic society was built on the fact of progressive expansion and on the theory of *laissez-faire*. The expansion of Europe, consisting both in a startling increase in the population and production of Europe itself and in an unprecedentedly rapid dissemination

¹ No such windfall awaited the less fortunate peace-makers of Versailles.

of the population, products and material civilization of Europe throughout other continents, created the fundamental change from the static order and outlook of the 18th century to the dynamic order and outlook of the 19th. The initial divergence which explains the whole opposition of principle between mercantilism and *laissez-faire* is that, while the mercantilists believed that the size of the cake was fixed, the philosophers of *laissez-faire* believed in a cake whose size could and should be indefinitely extended through the enterprise and inventiveness of individual effort. Restriction and discrimination are the natural reaction of producers to a limitation of demand. In the 19th century most people were convinced, on the plausible evidence around them, that a continuously increasing production would be absorbed by a progressively and infinitely expanding demand.

In a world of this kind goods could pass freely from place to place — and not only goods, but men. Freedom of migration was an even more vital factor in the 19th-century economic and political system, and more necessary to its survival, than freedom of trade. Newcomers were made welcome by the prospect of their contribution to an expanding production; unlimited opportunity for all who were willing to work was an accepted item in the 19th-century creed. The same kind of welcome awaited new nations, whether formed, as in Germany, by a belated application of the mercantilist policy of breaking down internal barriers to unity, or, as in eastern Europe, by splitting off from former multi-national units. Nations, like individuals, had their contribution to make; and freedom of opportunity should not be denied to them. Human nature being fallible, clashes might no doubt occur. But just as order at home was not threatened by sporadic outbreaks of crime, so occasional wars between the more

THE CLIMAX OF NATIONALISM

turbulent nations did not constitute a serious menace to the stability of international society.

The success of this 19th-century compromise between a closely-knit world economic system and unqualified recognition of the political diversity and independence of nations was rendered possible by two subtle and valuable pieces of make-believe which were largely unconscious and contained sufficient elements of reality to make them plausible. These two salutary illusions were, first, that the world economic system was truly international, and second, that the economic and political systems were entirely separate and operated independently of each other.

The illusion of the international character of the world economic system rested on the conviction that it was not an artificial creation of man but part of an order of nature. Under absolute *laissez-faire* all valid economic decisions are assumed to be taken by individuals in the furtherance of their own interest and any central economic authority (or, in present-day terms, planning) to be superfluous, so that the system as a whole remains "impersonal". The 19th-century economic order enjoyed its brilliant success largely because people believed that its operation was impersonal and thus in the truest sense international. In fact the hypothetical conditions of absolute *laissez-faire* did not obtain in 19th-century society, or in any other society which has ever existed. To put the issue in its simplest and most concrete form, progressive expansion was the product not of the principle of universal free trade (which was never applied, and whose application would have been found intolerable) but of the open British market. The colonization of the empty spaces, the development of machine-driven industry dependent on coal and the opening-up of world-wide communications through railways and shipping services proceeded apace under British leadership,

PROPERTY OF
CARNEGIE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
LIBRARY

and stimulated everywhere the emergence and development of nations and national consciousness ; and the counterpart of this " expansion of England " was the free market provided in Britain from the eighteen-forties onward for the natural products, foodstuffs and raw materials of the rest of the world. In recent years it has become customary to dwell on British exports as the foundation of Britain's greatness. It might in most respects be more relevant to stress the significance of her position as the greatest import and *entrepôt* market. The British have in the past been universally regarded first and foremost as a nation of merchants rather than of manufacturers ; and beyond doubt the primary foundation of the 19th-century economic system was the provision of a single wide-open and apparently insatiable market for all consumable commodities. It was the existence of this national market which made the so-called international system work.

The international system, simple in its conception but infinitely complex in its technique, called into being a delicate and powerful financial machine whose seat was in the city of London. The corollary of an international commodity market was an international discount market, an international market for shipping freights, an international insurance market and, finally, an international capital market. All this required and depended on the effective maintenance of a single international monetary standard into which national currencies were exchangeable at fixed rates ; and this in turn presupposed a central control over the currency policies of the different national units, enforced by the potential sanction of a refusal to deal in " unsound " currencies. The prestige of sterling, proudly anchored to the gold standard by the Bank Act of 1844, made it the only serious candidate for the role of international money. The Bank of England, as custodian of the

integrity of sterling, found itself — unwillingly and for the most part unwittingly — the final arbiter and court of appeal and the central executive authority of the international system of trade and finance. All gold-standard countries had to keep pace with one another in expanding and contracting the flow of money and trade; and it was the London market which inevitably set the pace. Just as mercantilism in the 17th and 18th centuries had transformed local economies into a single national economy, so in the 19th century the merchants, brokers and bankers of London, acting under the sovereign responsibility of the “old lady of Threadneedle Street”, transformed the national economies into a single world economy. It mattered little that they had never sought the function which they discharged, and that they remained unconscious of its scope and importance. The task was thrust on them. “Money will not manage itself”, wrote Bagehot in the first chapter of his famous book, “and Lombard Street has a great deal of money to manage.”¹ Here was the seat of government of the world economy of the so-called age of *laissez-faire*.

If then the 19th-century system was the work of art rather than of nature, what remains of its international character? No other market could hope to challenge the supremacy of London; and mere supremacy might be held to justify its claims in terms of what would be called nowadays “functional” internationalism. The fetishism of the gold standard made sterling a real international currency. The foreign financier or merchant dealing with, or established in, London enjoyed all the benefits of the system, was treated on his merits and suffered no disability or discrimination. Above all the London market achieved, and deserved, a remarkable reputation for probity and

¹ W. Bagehot, *Lombard Street* (concluding words of ch. i.).

impartiality. It certainly did not seek to serve British interests in any narrow or exclusive sense; the commerce of the world was a British concern. Nevertheless the control exercised from London was continuous; and because it was not consciously directed to anything but the day-to-day task of ensuring the maintenance of sound currency and balanced exchanges — the control which made the whole system work — it was autocratic, without appeal and completely effective. Nor was it, properly speaking, international, much less representative. It was at once supra-national and British.

The second illusion which secured acceptance of the 19th-century world order sprang from the formal divorce between political and economic power. The secrecy in which the activities of the city of London were veiled served to mask economic realities from those who thought in traditional political terms; and these activities were altogether withdrawn from political scrutiny. Yet it was precisely because economic authority was silently wielded by a single highly centralized autocracy that political authority could safely be parcelled out in national units, large and small, increasingly subject to democratic control. This economic authority was a political fact of the first importance; and the British economic power of which it was a function was inseparably bound up with the political power conferred by the uncontested supremacy of the British navy. But these interconnexions of political and economic power were overlooked; and since it was not recognized, either by those who exercised the control or by those who submitted to it, how far the political independence of nations was conditioned by the pseudo-international world economic order based on British supremacy, there was no resentment of what would nowadays be regarded as infringements of national sovereignty. Thus the democratized nations of

the 19th century went on from strength to strength proclaiming aloud, and exercising in the political sphere, the unrestricted rights of nationalism, while tacitly accepting the discipline of a supreme external arbiter of their economic destinies in the disguise of a law of nature. On this supposed separation of political and economic power, and this real blend of freedom and authority, the 19th-century order rested.

In the eighteen-seventies the first subterranean rumblings began to shake this splendid edifice. Germany emerged beyond challenge as the leading continental power; and it was in Germany that Friedrich List had sown many years before the first seeds of rebellion against Britain's world economic system. The last imperfect triumphs of free trade were left behind in the 'sixties. The German tariff of 1879 was long remembered as the first modern "scientific" tariff — a piece of economic manipulation in the interests of national policy. After 1870 the constructive work of nation-building seemed complete. Nationalism came to be associated with "the Balkans" and with all that that ominous term implied. When British commercial and British naval supremacy were first seriously challenged in the 'nineties, ominous cracks soon began to appear in the structure. When this supremacy in both its forms was broken by the first world war, the 19th-century economic system collapsed in utter and irretrievable ruin. Subsequent struggles to restore it merely showed how little its essential foundations had been understood.

The Third Period

The third period brings yet another change in the character of the nation. The catastrophic growth of nationalism and bankruptcy of internationalism which were the symptoms

of the period can be traced back to their origins in the years after 1870 but reach their full overt development only after 1914. This does not mean that individuals became in this period more outrageously nationalist in sentiment or more unwilling to cooperate with their fellow-men of other nations. It means that nationalism began to operate in a new political and economic environment. The phenomenon cannot be understood without examination of the three main underlying causes which provoked it : the bringing of new social strata within the effective membership of the nation, the visible reunion of economic with political power, and the increase in the number of nations.

The rise of new social strata to full membership of the nation marked the last three decades of the 19th century throughout western and central Europe. Its landmarks were the development of industry and industrial skills ; the rapid expansion in numbers and importance of urban populations ; the growth of workers' organizations and of the political consciousness of the workers ; the introduction of universal compulsory education ; and the extension of the franchise. These changes, while they seemed logical steps in a process inaugurated long before, quickly began to affect the content of national policy in a revolutionary way. The " democratization " of the nation in the earlier part of the century had resulted in the establishment of popular control over the functions of maintaining law and order, guaranteeing the rights of property and, in general, " holding the ring " for the operations of an economic society managed and directed from another centre under rules of its own. The " socialization " of the nation which set in towards the end of the century brought about a far more radical change. Hitherto, as Peterloo and the fate of the Chartists had shown, the masses had had little power to protect themselves against the immense hardships and sufferings which *laissez-faire*

industrialism imposed on them. Henceforth the political power of the masses was directed to improving their own social and economic lot. The primary aim of national policy was no longer merely to maintain order and conduct what was narrowly defined as public business, but to minister to the welfare of members of the nation and to enable them to earn their living. The democratization of the nation in the second period had meant the assertion of the political claims of the dominant middle class. The socialization of the nation for the first time brings the economic claims of the masses into the forefront of the picture. The defence of wages and employment becomes a concern of national policy and must be asserted, if necessary, against the national policies of other countries; and this in turn gives the worker an intimate practical interest in the policy and power of his nation. The socialization of the nation has as its natural corollary the nationalization of socialism.¹

The 20th-century alliance between nationalism and socialism may be traced back to its first seed in the revolutionary nationalism of the Jacobins; and in France, where the Jacobin tradition remained potent, the Left has asserted itself in successive national crises — in 1871, in 1917 and again in 1940 — as the custodian of the national interest against the compromisers and defeatists of the Right. In its modern form, however, the alliance dates from Bismarck, who, schooled by Lassalle, showed the German workers how much they had to gain from a vigorous and ruthless nationalism — “no sickness insurance without Sedan”, as

¹ It need hardly be said that the term “national socialism” is not a “Nazi” invention. It seems to have been first used in Germany about 1895 by a group of intellectuals formed by Friedrich Naumann. A few years later it was applied in Austria-Hungary to those Social Democrats who demanded the organization of the party as a federation of “national” units as opposed to those who wished to maintain a single “international” party for the whole of the Habsburg dominions.

a recent writer has put it.¹ In the same period the word "jingoism" was coined in Great Britain to describe something that had not hitherto existed — the nationalism of the masses; and a decade later it was answered from the other side by Harcourt's famous "we are all socialists now". The successes of Tory democracy, the career of Joseph Chamberlain and the adoption by the Liberal party after 1906 of far-reaching measures of social reform were all straws in the wind. National policy was henceforth founded on the support of the masses; and the counterpart was the loyalty of the masses to a nation which had become the instrument of their collective interests and ambitions.²

By the early nineteen-hundreds, therefore, the breach between the "two nations" had been substantially healed in all the advanced European countries. In the 19th century, when the nation belonged to the middle class and the worker had no fatherland, socialism had been international. The crisis of 1914 showed in a flash that, except in backward Russia, this attitude was everywhere obsolete. The mass of workers knew instinctively on which side their bread was buttered; and Lenin was a lone voice proclaiming the

¹ F. Borkenau, *Socialism, National or International* (1942), p. 51. This book contains the best critical analysis known to me of the process which I have called "the nationalization of socialism". Its later chapters foreshadowing an organization of Europe west of Russia under Anglo-American leadership bear marks of their date and of a certain anti-Russian bias in the author.

² In a work originally published in 1907 the Austrian Social Democrat, Otto Bauer, argued that socialism meant "an increasing differentiation of nations, a sharper emphasis on their peculiarities, a sharper division between their characters", and attacked those who believed that socialism would "diminish or even remove the differences between nations" (Otto Bauer, *Die Nationalitätenfrage und die Sozialdemokratie*, 2nd ed. pp. 105-6). Writers on international relations in English-speaking countries had less insight; for the most part they were content to congratulate themselves on the increasing "popular" interest in international affairs and believed that this would promote international concord.

defeat of his own country as a socialist aim and crying treason against the "social-chauvinists". International socialism ignominiously collapsed. Lenin's desperate rear-guard action to revive it made sense only in Russia, and there only so long as revolutionary conditions persisted. Once the "workers' state" was effectively established, "socialism in one country" was the logical corollary. The subsequent history of Russia and the tragi-comedy of the Communist International are an eloquent tribute to the solidarity of the alliance between nationalism and socialism.

The second underlying cause of the modern inflation of nationalism — its extension from the political to the economic sphere through the reassertion of political power over economic policy — has been everywhere recognized. But it has commonly been attributed to the perversity of politicians or to the nefarious influence of big business, and its far more significant connexion with the socialization of the nation overlooked. The democratic nationalism of our second period had proved manageable and compatible with some kind of international order precisely because its aspirations were predominantly political and could be satisfied within the framework of the 19th-century *laissez-faire* or "night-watchman" state. The social nationalism (or national socialism) of the third period, by shifting the ground from political to economic aspirations, brought about the abdication of the *laissez-faire* state in favour of the "social service" state. The transition from the predominance of the middle class to the predominance of the masses, or from liberal democracy to mass democracy, was, so far as concerned the nature of the state, the transition from politics to economics. Henceforth the functions of the nation-state were as much economic as political. The assumption of these functions presupposed the abrogation of the international economic order and would, even if there

had been no other obstacles, have prevented a revival of that order after 1919. Nationalism had invaded and conquered the economic domain from which the 19th century had so cunningly excluded it. The single world economy was replaced by a multiplicity of national economics, each concerned with the well-being of its own members.¹

The link between "economic nationalism" and the socialization of the nation emerged clearly in the decisive and fateful step taken by all the great industrial countries after 1919 — the closing of national frontiers to large-scale immigration. The middle-class governments of the 19th century, concerned with the importance of cheap and abundant labour to swell the tide of production and profits, had been under no political compulsion to give prior consideration to the wage-levels and standards of living of their own workers; and for fifty years the exclusion of the foreign worker had been the hopeless dream of all labour organizations (it had even preoccupied Marx's First International). Now the prohibition was imposed, contrary to the patent interests of employer and capitalist, almost without opposition; ² and one of the most effective and necessary safety-valves of the 19th-century international order, the avenue of escape opened to the enterprising and the discontented, was closed with a snap. No single measure did

¹ Modern policies of economic nationalism, since they represent a breach with the international order of *laissez-faire* and are in some respects identical with practices current before the rise of *laissez-faire*, have sometimes been dubbed "neo-mercantilist". This designation is, however, misleading. From the standpoint of nationalism they constitute not a return to the past, but a further stage in a continuous process of the extension of the nation from the aristocracy to the middle class and from the middle class to the masses.

² It should not be forgotten that the attitude of the workers was precisely imitated by the professional middle class in similar conditions. Medical opposition in Great Britain to the immigration of refugee doctors in the nineteen-thirties was a conspicuous and not particularly creditable example.

more to render a renewal of the clash between nations inevitable. No single measure more clearly exhibited the inherent drive of the new and powerful labour interests towards policies of exclusive nationalism. When in the nineteen-thirties humanitarian pressure demanded the admission of alien refugees to Great Britain, consent was given on the condition that they did not "seek employment". The nation was prepared to receive those whose support would be a charge on the national wealth, but not those whose productive capacity might help to increase it.

But this was merely one symptom of a far broader trend. Only in Great Britain did the interest of the worker in cheap food keep the labour movement for some time faithful to the free trade tradition; and even here, after 1931, the greater attraction of wage stability won the day. Workers became interested equally with employers in measures of protection and subsidies for industry. Advocacy of such measures proved a fruitful meeting-ground for the hitherto conflicting forces of capital and labour; and national and social policies were welded more firmly than ever together. The same instruments serve both. The "monopoly of foreign trade" and similar organizations elsewhere conform to irreproachably socialist principles; yet they have also proved most efficient instruments of economic nationalism. "Planned economy" is a Janus with a nationalist as well as a socialist face; if its doctrine seems socialist, its pedigree is unimpeachably nationalist. A few years ago "socialism means strength" would have seemed, even to socialists, a paradoxical slogan. To-day when a nation determines to exert its utmost strength in war, it resorts without hesitation to policies of out-and-out socialism. Now that *laissez-faire* has succumbed to the joint onslaught of nationalism and socialism, its two assailants have become in a strange way almost indistinguishable in their aims; and both have

become immensely more powerful through the alliance.

3. The third cause of the inflation of nationalism — the startling increase in the number of nations during our third period — is one of which sufficient account is rarely taken. Here too the year 1870 marks a significant turning-point. Down to that time the influence of nationalism had been to diminish the number of sovereign and independent political units in Europe. In 1871 after the unification of Germany and Italy had been completed there were fourteen; in 1914 there were twenty; in 1924 the number had risen to twenty-six. It would be an understatement to say that the virtual doubling in fifty years of the number of independent European states aggravated in degree the problem of European order. It altered that problem in kind — the more so since the convention ruling in 1871 that only five or at most six Great Powers were concerned in major European issues no longer commanded general acceptance. Nor could the settlement after the first world war be regarded as in any way final or conclusive. National self-determination became a standing invitation to secession. The movement which dismembered Austria-Hungary and created Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia was bound to be succeeded by movements for the dismemberment of Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia. Given the premises of nationalism the process was natural and legitimate, and no end could be set to it. After 1914 it spread rapidly to the Arab world, to India, to the Far East; though elsewhere the British Dominions offered the more impressive spectacle of separate nations growing to maturity within the unsevered bonds of the Commonwealth. Moreover, this dispersal of authority occurred at a time when both military and economic developments were forcing on the world a rapid concentration of power: it not only ignored, but defied, a trend deeply rooted in the industrial conditions of the period. The bare fact that there are in

Europe to-day more than twenty, and in the world more than sixty, political units claiming the status of independent sovereign states goes far by itself to explain the aggravation of the evils of nationalism in our third period.

Although, however, this multiplication of national frontiers in Europe and the extension throughout the world of a conception hitherto limited to western Europe and its direct dependencies have given an immense impetus to "economic nationalism", it may well seem unfair to apply this term in an invidious sense to the natural and legitimate determination of "backward" nations to share in advantages hitherto monopolized by those who had had so long a start in industrial development. The 19th-century concentration of industry in a few great countries in western Europe, which furnished their industrial products to the rest of the world and consumed in return its food and raw materials, may have been a highly practical example of the division of labour. But this privileged status of the industrial nations was self-destructive in so far as it was bound sooner or later to create a desire and capacity for industrial production and a development of national consciousness in the less privileged countries. List had argued as long ago as 1840 that, while free trade might be the interest of industrially mature nations, protective tariffs were a necessary and legitimate instrument for developing backward industries and countries to a state of maturity. In the 19th century Germany and the United States had both learned and profited by this lesson. It was now taken up by new and smaller nations all over the world, and the whole machinery of economic nationalism was set in motion to develop their industries and bring them some fraction of the power and prestige which went with industrial development. Such procedures inevitably curtailed international trade and multiplied competition for narrowing markets.

The results were disastrous : yet nobody was to blame for them. They arose simply from the multiplication of the number of sovereign and independent nations, each claiming its share in the profits and prerogatives of industrial production.

These three factors — the socialization of the nation, the nationalization of economic policy and the geographical extension of nationalism — have combined to produce the characteristic totalitarian symptoms of our third period. The combination of these factors has found expression in two world wars, or two instalments of the same world war, in a single generation, and has imparted to them a peculiar quality of embittered exasperation for which it would be difficult to find a precedent in any war in history.

The Climax

The world war of 1914 was the first war between socialized nations and took on for the first time the character of what has since been called "total war". The view of war as the exclusive affair of governments and armies was tacitly abandoned. Before hostilities ended, the obliteration of the traditional line between soldier and civilian had gone very far ; attack on civilian morale by propaganda, by mass terrorism, by blockade and by bombing from the air had become a recognized technique of war. Popular national hatreds were for the first time deliberately inflamed as an instrument of policy, and it came to be regarded in many quarters as a legitimate war aim, not merely to defeat the enemy armed forces, but to inflict punishment on members of the enemy nation. In the second world war any valid or useful distinction between armed forces and civilian populations disappeared almost from the outset ; both were merely different forms of man-power and woman-power

mobilized for different tasks and on different "fronts" in the same struggle. The individual had become little more, in the eyes either of his own national government or of that of the enemy, than a unit in the organized ranks of the nation. In May 1940 an act of Parliament empowered the British Government to make regulations "requiring persons to place themselves, their services and their property at the disposal of His Majesty" for any purpose arising out of the prosecution of the war. Nationalism and socialism joined hands to applaud the most unreservedly totalitarian measure ever adopted by any nation at its hour of greatest need.

The re-establishment of national political authority over the economic system, which was a necessary corollary of the socialization of the nation, was no doubt one of the factors contributing to the situation which produced the two world wars. But it received from them so powerful an impetus that its relation to them is as much one of effect as of cause. The immediate and revolutionary consequence of the outbreak of war in 1914 was the assumption by every belligerent government of the right to create and control its own national money and the deposition of sterling from its role as the universal currency. These measures had their counterpart in commercial policy. The careful respect extended for more than two centuries to the private property and business interests of the ordinary citizen of a belligerent country was altogether set aside. After 1914 both personal relations and commercial transactions, direct or indirect, with enemy citizens became a criminal offence; and for the first time in the history of modern war enemy private property was confiscated—a devastating blow at the foundations of *laissez-faire* society and *bourgeois* civilization. International law, framed for days when munitions and military stores were the only contraband and neutrals

traded freely with belligerents, was severely strained by submarine warfare on the one side and by an "all-in" blockade on the other. More important still, the change in spirit extended from the methods of war to its purposes. It soon became clear that the terms of peace, whichever side emerged victorious, would constitute an attack on the standard of living of the defeated nation. The kind of policy hitherto reserved for colonial wars against backward peoples was for the first time being turned by European powers against one another. War among socialized nations inevitably became an instrument for securing economic advantages for the victor and inflicting economic disabilities on the defeated. Modern wars are fought to a finish and the loser has no rights.

Nor would it be a legitimate diagnosis which treated these symptoms as the passing aberration of nations at war. In spite of the novel machinery provided by the League of Nations, the period between the wars was marked by a progressive and catastrophic deterioration in international relations, broken only by a brief and uncertain respite between 1924 and 1929. During these twenty years more agreement between nations was recorded on paper, but less substantial agreement attained in practice on major political and economic issues, than at any recent period; nor were acts of aggression confined to those who became the aggressors in the second world war. It would be erroneous to attribute this deterioration to an unhappy accident or to the malevolence of a few men or a few nations; evil men will always be found to turn an unhealthy condition to account. Neither the delegates of fifty or more nations who met at Geneva nor those at home who instructed them were abnormally quarrelsome or abnormally obstinate men. On the contrary their passion for agreement was shown by the pertinacity with which they signed meaningless protocols and resolu-

tions in order to maintain at least the forms of agreement even where the substance was lacking. These men failed to agree precisely because they represented nations in this last and culminating phase of their evolution. In no period has there been more talk of cooperation between nations ; in few periods less of the reality. As custodians of the living standards, employment and amenities of their whole populations, modern nations are, in virtue of their nature and function, probably less capable than any other groups in modern times of reaching agreement with one another.

The contrast between the comparatively law-abiding habits of members of a national community and the law-breaking proclivities of nation members of the international community has long been a truism ; and recent rapid decline in the observance of international law is common ground among all observers. The decline, like the decline in international agreement, is easily explicable in terms of the preceding analysis. The international law of the 17th and 18th centuries rested on the good faith of sovereigns. What was at stake was the personal execution of personal promises and obligations ; and the sense of solidarity among monarchs was sufficient to leave them with a certain desire to keep their word to one another. In the 19th century solidarity between middle-class governments, buttressed on respect for the rights of property, and reinforced by fear of offending the international financial authorities in London by any irregularity in the discharge of obligations, still sufficed to keep the observance of international law and agreements on a tolerably high level. Paradoxically enough, it was Bismarck who first diagnosed the symptoms of decline and ascribed it to the unreliability of democracies. The diagnosis was too narrow. The decline was due not to any particular form of government or constitution, but to the socialized nation of which

Bismarck was one of the first promoters.

In the contemporary period the discharge of any major international obligation depends on the will of the nation, under whatever form of government, to honour it. An 18th-century monarch, operating with foreign mercenaries or with pressed troops drawn from a social class which had no voice in the management of affairs, could undertake to make war in a given contingency with the reasonable assurance that the undertaking could be carried out. In the 19th century the rise of liberal democracy led Great Britain to adopt an extremely cautious attitude towards commitments likely to involve anything more serious than a naval demonstration;¹ and the American constitution has up to the present virtually precluded the assumption by the United States of an obligation to make war in any circumstances whatever. In the modern age of the socialized nation and of total war, a prudent government, whatever its constitutional powers, may well doubt its competence to give such an undertaking — at any rate for more than a few days or weeks ahead; and this caution applies in particular to unspecified obligations like those in the Covenant of the League of Nations. Even the policing of conquered enemy territory with conscript armies is an obligation which no modern democracy can lightly assume for any prolonged period.

Financial and economic commitments are equally suspect. They may be accepted by governments in all good faith, but without full understanding of their consequences; and should these eventually turn out to be detrimental to the standard of living or level of employment in one of the

¹ It is worth recalling the three classic pronouncements on the subject: Castlereagh's State Paper of May 5, 1820; Gladstone's refusal in the House of Commons on August 10, 1870, to treat the Belgian guarantee treaty as a "rigid" obligation; and Salisbury's memorandum of May 29, 1901.

THE CLIMAX OF NATIONALISM

contracting countries, they will be dishonoured, as Great Britain dishonoured her financial obligations to the United States in 1933.¹ Nor can the general provisions of international law be any longer observed by a modern nation if their observance is found or believed to involve loss of life or risk of defeat in time of war, or serious economic loss in time of peace. The first obligation of the modern national government, which no other obligation will be allowed to override, is to its own people. It would be absurd to lament this state of affairs as proof of increased human wickedness; it might equally well be regarded as proof of a sharpened social conscience. But whatever view we take of it, it would be folly to neglect the overwhelming evidence that modern national governments cannot and will not observe international treaties or rules of international law when these become burdensome or dangerous to the welfare or security of their own nation. Any so-called international order built on contingent obligations assumed by national governments is an affair of lath and plaster and will crumble into dust as soon as pressure is placed upon it. In peace, as in war, the international law of the age of sovereigns is incompatible with the socialized nation. The failure to create an international community of nations on the basis of international treaties and international law marks the final bankruptcy of nationalism in the west.

¹ The *locus classicus* on the subject is the statement made by the then Chancellor of the Exchequer, Neville Chamberlain, on the occasion of the last full payment made by Great Britain under the American war debt agreement: "When we are told that contracts must be kept sacred, and that we must on no account depart from the obligations which we have undertaken, it must not be forgotten that we have other obligations and responsibilities, obligations not only to our own countrymen but to many millions of human beings throughout the world, whose happiness or misery may depend upon how far the fulfilment of these obligations is insisted upon on the one side and met on the other" (*House of Commons Official Report*, December 14, 1932, vol. 273, col. 354).

Meanwhile the extension of the geographical limits of nationalism has meant not only a multiplication of the number of nations, but a planting of nationalism in new and unfamiliar soils. In western Europe nationalism had grown in soils fertilized by the traditions of Christendom, of natural law and of secular individualism. In German lands the natural law and individualist traditions had struck only light roots ; in Russia and other countries dominated by the Orthodox Church they had been ignored or rejected. Beyond Europe nationalism was now spreading to countries where every Christian or European tradition was alien, and where the illogical inhibitions which had for so long helped to restrain European nationalism were unknown. Even in Europe the ruthlessness of the first world war did much to break down these inhibitions. The second world war was started by a German power which scarcely paid even lip-service either to the humanitarian tradition of individualism or to the universalist tradition of natural law. Mass deportations of civilians have been carried on all over Europe ; in eastern Europe a large number of Jews have been deliberately exterminated. Germany in several cases, and Japan in the notorious attack on Pearl Harbour, took military action without any previous declaration of war. International law had come to seem almost irrelevant except perhaps when it could be invoked to discredit an opponent. In the conduct of the war there have been gradations of inhumanity and ruthlessness, significantly corresponding to the degree in which the respective theatres of war had participated in the western European tradition. It has been fought with greater ferocity in eastern than in western Europe, and with most savagery of all in Asia and the Pacific. Neither Russia nor Japan is a party to the Geneva convention on prisoners of war ; and in Germany powerful and specifically Nazi organs showed an increasing disregard for its obligations.

Yet it would be premature to claim for western Europe any exemption even from the worst brutalities of international strife. The collapse of military discipline and the release of the conquered countries from four years of grinding oppression may yet lead to outbreaks which will match in horror anything that has occurred in other parts of the world. Nor is there much in declared national policies which holds out hope of an ultimate pacification between nations. Perhaps the apex of nationalism is reached when it comes to be regarded as an enlightened policy to remove men, women and children forcibly from their homes and transfer them from place to place in order to create homogeneous national units. Such plans were first canvassed in the first flush of French revolutionary nationalism when the Jacobins wished to deport the German-speaking population of Alsace and replace it with good Frenchmen.¹ Having remained dormant for a hundred and twenty-five years, they revived after the first world war. In January 1919 Venizelos was already proposing to tidy up national frontiers in Asia Minor by "a wholesale and mutual transfer of population"; and about the same time Mackinder in his famous essay in geopolitics suggested an exchange of the German population of East Prussia for the Polish population of Posen.² Minor transfers of population were subsequently carried out between Turkey and Greece and Greece and Bulgaria; and these desperate expedients were unhappily invested by the League of Nations with a spurious and untimely air of high-mindedness, which was apparently not dispersed even when Hitler drew liberally on the precedent thus created. To-day annexations of territory are regarded

¹ Authorities quoted in F. Hertz, *Nationality in History and Politics*, p. 86.

² H. Mackinder, *Democratic Ideals and Reality* (Pelican ed., 1944), p. 121.

as more, not less, respectable if they are accompanied by wholesale deportation of the existing population — not perhaps the most callous act recorded in history, but surely the most explicit exaltation of the nation over the individual as an end in itself, the mass sacrifice of human beings to the idol of nationalism.

A Fourth Period?

The second world war thus marks the climax and the catastrophe of the third period of modern international relations, and leaves us on the threshold of a fourth period whose character will probably shape the destinies of mankind for a century to come. A first view suggests beyond doubt that nationalism has never been stronger than at this moment; and this view would lead to almost unqualified pessimism about the future of international relations. Yet closer analysis may reveal certain trends, not necessarily more reassuring, but at any rate sufficiently different to suggest that, whatever may be in store in the next few years, nations and international relations are in process of undergoing another subtle, not yet clearly definable, change.

Paradoxically enough, certain features of the war itself seem to mark a retrogression from the unqualified nationalism of the preceding period. The absence of any trace of national exaltation or enthusiasm on the outbreak of the second world war offered in all countries — and not least in Germany itself — a striking contrast, which was much remarked at the time, to the patriotic fervour of 1914. National hatreds have lost their old spontaneous frankness, and mask themselves delicately in ideological trappings. In Germany the “hymn of hate” has not reappeared; in Great Britain what is called “Vansittartism” is the rather shamefaced rationalization of a frank popular emotion of

the last war. Even the "nationalism" of Hitler became, as time went on, less and less specifically German. It was "Aryan" or "Nordic"; and, driven first by the needs of *Grossraumwirtschaft* and later by the demand for manpower, it began to discover these attributes in unexpected places. Full and impartial information of the extent and significance of "quislingism" in many countries can hardly be expected for some time. It was perhaps not surprising that it should have infected newly created national units like Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia; but widespread "collaboration" in the European country with the oldest and most deeply rooted national tradition of all was a new and startling development. Ten or twelve million foreign workers in German factories, factories in occupied countries working under high pressure on war production, substantial contingents of a dozen foreign nationalities embodied in the German armies, the extensive recruitment of foreigners not only for the rank and file, but for the officer corps, of the crack and highly trusted *Waffen S.S.* — these phenomena are not wholly explicable in terms of brute force, and seem difficult to reconcile with the picture of an age of unbridled and militant nationalism. Political warfare, whose contribution to Hitler's victories in 1940 and 1941 can hardly be denied, is at once a symptom and a cause of the decline of nationalism. It succeeds only by finding rifts in national solidarity; it aims at widening and deepening those rifts. Some plausibility must be accorded to a shrewd comment penned at the peak of German power in Europe that "Hitler's successes are basically rooted, not in his extreme nationalism, but on the contrary in his shrewd judgment of the decay of nationalism among his neighbours".¹

These casual pointers might be dismissed as misleading and exceptional if they did not seem to coincide with other

¹ F. Borkenau, *Socialism, National or International* (1942), p. 165.

and broader indications. As the second world war draws to a close, none of the main forces that have gone to make the victory is nationalist in the older sense. Neither Great Britain nor the British Commonwealth was ever finally engulfed in the nationalist tide. The word "British" has never acquired a strictly national connotation; and there is no name for the citizen of the entity officially known as "the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland". More significant are the non-national names and multi-national status of the two new giants of world politics — the United States of America and the Soviet Union. It is the pride of the United States to have been the "melting-pot" of nations. In the American army for the liberation of Europe men of German, Polish, Italian, Croat and a dozen other national origins have marched side by side; in the presidential election of 1940 one candidate could speak with pride of his Dutch, the other of his German, ancestry. In the Soviet Union a fluctuating attitude towards the national issue has ended, under a Georgian leader, in the emphatic promulgation of a comprehensive Soviet allegiance which embraces in its overriding loyalty a multiplicity of component nations.

The climate at the end of the second world war will therefore be very different from that of 1919 when the disruption of the Habsburg, Romanov and Turkish empires under the banner of national self-determination was regarded as a landmark of progress in international relations. This may well turn out to have been the last triumph of the old fissiparous nationalism, of the ideology of the small nation as the ultimate political and economic unit; for it was one of those victories which prove self-destructive to the victor. Political changes, whether evolutionary or revolutionary, rarely make themselves felt everywhere with equal intensity or at the same rate of advance. In Asia the demand

THE CLIMAX OF NATIONALISM

for self-determination may still be heard, though perhaps more faintly and less confidently than of late. In Europe some of the small units of the past may continue for a few generations longer to eke out a precariously independent existence; others may retain the shadow of independence when the reality has disappeared. But their military and economic insecurity has been demonstrated beyond recall. They can survive only as an anomaly and an anachronism in a world which has moved on to the other forms of organization. But it remains to consider what these forms may be, and whether there is any hope of making them more tolerable to mankind than the forms of the recent past.

II

THE PROSPECTS OF INTERNATIONALISM

THE contemporary challenge to the nation as the final and acceptable unit of international organization comes on two fronts — from within and from without, from the standpoint of idealism and from the standpoint of power. On the plane of morality, it is under attack from those who denounce its inherently totalitarian implications and proclaim that any international authority worth the name must interest itself in the rights and well-being not of nations but of men and women. On the plane of power, it is being sapped by modern technological developments which have made the nation obsolescent as the unit of military and economic organization and are rapidly concentrating effective decision and control in the hands of great multi-national units. The two attacks are not wholly independent of each other; for it is the failure of the nation-state to assure military security or economic well-being which has in part inspired the widespread questioning of the moral credentials of nationalism. The future depends on the strength of each, and on the nature of the balance which may be struck between them. The challenge from within may be considered first.

Individual and Nation

Every established historical institution acquires vested interests and stakes out for itself claims which must from time to time, and especially in periods of crisis, be submitted anew to the test of first principles. The challenge to nationalism does not exclude recognition of the place of

nations in an international order ; it clears the way for a better understanding of what that place is. The nation is not a " natural " or " biological " group — in the sense, for example, of the family. It has no " natural " rights in the sense that the individual can be said to have natural rights. The nation is not a definable and clearly recognizable entity ; nor is it universal. It is confined to certain periods of history and to certain parts of the world. To-day — in the most nation-conscious of all epochs — it would still probably be fair to say that a large numerical majority of the population of the world feel no allegiance to any nation. Nevertheless the nation is something far more than a voluntary association ; and it embodies in itself, though overlaid with conventional trappings, such natural and universal elements as attachment to one's native land and speech and a sense of wider kinship than that of family. The modern nation is a historical group. It has its place and function in a wider society, and its claims cannot be denied or ignored. But they can in no circumstances be absolute, being governed by historical conditions of time and place ; and they have to be considered at the present moment primarily in relation to the needs both of security and of economic well-being. What has to be challenged and rejected is the claim of nationalism to make the nation the sole rightful sovereign repository of political power and the ultimate constituent unit of world organization — a claim gradually asserted over the past three centuries, though not finally conceded, and then only for the European continent, till 1919.

It is a fundamental tenet of nationalism that any international order must take the form of an association of nations — that, just as the national community is composed of individual members, so the international community must be made up of nation members. In the first period of

international relations reviewed in the previous chapter this assumption had been natural enough ; the members of the international community were individual sovereigns. In the second period the personified nation had taken the place of the person of the sovereign. The assumption of the previous period was beginning to wear a little thin. But the survival of monarchy in all the principal countries helped to keep it in being. The concert of Europe was originally conceived as a conclave of monarchs or their personal agents ; and periodical meetings between sovereigns continued to be a significant part of its machinery. In the third period even this myth of an international conclave of rulers was dead, though one faint attempt was made to revive it in a democratic guise through the publicity given to the largely imaginary personal character of relations between Austen Chamberlain, Briand and Stresemann. But the myth had by this time obtained so strong a hold that the substitution of corporate nation for individual ruler was for the most part quite unconscious. Few people in the period between the two wars doubted that the international community must be composed of nations or were specifically aware that this enormous assumption was being made.

The supposed analogy between a national community of individuals and an international community of nations, which was the stock-in-trade of much international oratory between the two wars, requires us to believe that the members of the international community, like the individuals composing a national community, are known, recognizable and comparable entities. This assumption is open to question. The sovereigns who formed the international community of the 17th and 18th centuries were members in virtue of their power ; the effective test was that of might. The same held good of the Great Powers forming the 19th-century concert of Europe. But the European settlement

of 1919 was based on the admission of two new and revolutionary claims — the claim of racial and linguistic groups to political independence and statehood in virtue of their quality as nations, and the claim of all independent states to effective membership of the international community. Membership of the international community thus became ostensibly a matter not of might but of right. In theory this seemed to mark an immense progress. In practice it proved impossible to discover any distinguishing marks by which the right of a self-styled nation to statehood could be objectively determined, or to exclude either the criterion of might or the criterion of political expediency, so that membership of the international community became itself a subject of uncertainty and dispute. Once it was proclaimed that nations, like individual human beings, were independent and self-determined entities, the question inevitably arose, What nations? And to this question there was no determinate answer.

The difficulty became far graver when political thinkers, pursuing the analogy of the individual, began to ascribe to nations natural rights such as freedom and equality. The 19th century recognized the freedom of nations as a corollary of democracy; and few thinkers either in the 19th century or between the two wars appear to have enquired into its precise meaning or validity. Yet freedom is a prerogative of the individual man and woman: it is only by a conventional metaphor, which easily becomes a *cliché* and is sometimes barely distinguishable from the Hitlerian exaltation of the nation as an object of worship and an end in itself, that freedom is attributed to nations. Freedom for a nation has meaning in so far as it is demanded by the men and women who make up the nation and felt by them as essential to their freedom. But national freedom which opens the way, as it did in some countries between the two

wars, for the consistent denial of elementary rights and liberties to large sections of the nation is little better than a contradiction in terms. It is well known that a good many people in central Europe after 1919 regretted the national freedom which had liberated them from the Habsburg empire. The assumption that ordinary men and women gladly accept loss of their means of livelihood or of their personal liberties as the price of the freedom of their nation will be readily made only by those who have not suffered the experience.

The same conclusion is equally valid for another right conventionally coupled with freedom—the right of equality. It is a commonplace that no political community can be established among individuals divided by conspicuous, significant and irremediable inequalities. Within the political unit this difficulty has usually been solved by including in the effective community only members of the most powerful group — white men, landowners, propertied classes and so forth — between whom some measure of equality exists; internationally this was the solution which in the 19th century gave some reality to an international community of Great Powers. This exclusive solution is no longer acceptable. But its rejection confronts the world with the impossible task of creating an international community out of units so fantastically disparate (leaving out of account the three predominant powers) as China and Albania, Norway and Brazil.¹ The reference in the draft Charter of the United Nations prepared at Dumbarton Oaks to “the

¹ For a discussion of the absence of equality as a fundamental flaw in the international community see E. H. Carr, *The Twenty Years' Crisis* (1939), pp. 206-10. The conclusion there recorded is that “the constant intrusion, or potential intrusion, of power renders almost meaningless any conception of equality between members of the international community”. At that time I still believed in the possibility of achieving a community of nations: it now seems to me clear that this belief must be abandoned.

THE PROSPECTS OF INTERNATIONALISM

sovereign equality of all peace-loving states " must be regarded as evidence either of a high degree of political simplicity or of a scarcely less discouraging readiness to pander to popular superstition. Like the right of freedom, the right of equality, however interpreted and conditioned, is one that can be attributed only to individuals, not to nations. What we are concerned to bring about is not the putting of Albania on an equal footing with China and Brazil, but the putting of the individual Albanian on an equal footing, in respect of personal rights and opportunities, with the individual Chinese or the individual Brazilian. The equality of nations is not only unattainable, but is neither equitable nor desirable. The equality of individual men and women is not indeed wholly attainable ; but it is an ideal which, at any rate in some of its connotations, can be accepted as a constant aim of human endeavour.

The challenge to the socialized nationalism of our third period thus issues in a protest against an international order which accepts as its basis the submersion of the rights of the individual in the rights of the nation. The international order of the future cannot be a society of free and equal nations bound together by a constitutional system of mutual rights and obligations. The freedom and equality which the makers of the coming peace must seek to establish is not a freedom and equality of nations, but a freedom and equality which will express themselves in the daily lives of men and women. It would not be difficult to detect, even before the outbreak of the second world war, symptoms of a growing consciousness of this need. The so-called " technical " organs of the League of Nations, including the International Labour Organization, imperfect though they were, displayed a far greater vitality than the political organs ; and it is significant that they were concerned with matters directly affecting the welfare of individuals rather than the security of nations.

13
PROPERTY OF
CARNEGIE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
LIBRARY

A similar evolution may perhaps rescue international law from the disarray into which it has fallen. A recent critic has distinguished "two strains" in modern international law :

One has been concerned with the relations between states as such . . . the other has used international law for promoting and protecting, through international cooperation and institutions, the interests and welfare of the individual.¹

The driving force behind any future international order must be a belief, however expressed, in the value of individual human beings irrespective of national affinities or allegiance and in a common and mutual obligation to promote their well-being.

On the other hand the demonstrable bankruptcy of nationalism, political and economic, must not be used to justify a plunge into the visionary solution of a supreme world directorate. The plea for the emancipation of the individual must not be interpreted as a plea for a sentimental and empty universalism. The sense of the unity of mankind, sufficient to support the common affirmation of certain universal principles and purposes, is not yet strong enough, according to all available evidence, to sustain an organization exercising a sovereign and universal authority. Popular slogans like Wendell Willkie's "one world" are misleading. To reduce the time of transit between two capitals from weeks to days, or from days to hours, provides no assurance, at any rate in the short run, of a growth of mutual understanding and united action. Notwithstanding the vast improvement in communications, indeed, the world may be less "one" to-day than it was in the 19th century when Great Britain enjoyed a greater ascendancy than had been

¹ H. Lauterpacht, *The Law of Nations, the Law of Nature and the Rights of Man* (Grotius Society, 1944), p. 27.

exercised from any single centre since the heyday of the Roman Empire. The contemporary world gravitates towards several competing centres of power ; and the very complexity of modern life makes for division. The lure of universality has had since 1919 a dangerous fascination for promoters of international order. The universality of any world organization almost inevitably tends to weaken its appeal to particular loyalties and particular interests. It was probably a weakness of the League of Nations that its commitments were general and anonymous : it imposed the same obligations on Albania as on Great Britain, and the same obligation on both to defend the independence of Belgium against Germany and that of Panama against the United States. These generalities could be justified in terms of pure reason but not translated into terms of concrete policy, so that the whole structure remained abstract and unreal. The history of the League of Nations, beginning with the insertion in the Covenant of the original Monroe Doctrine reservation, bears witness to the persistence of attempts to escape from a theoretical and ineffective universalism into a practical and workable regionalism. A world organization may be a necessary convenience as well as a valuable symbol. But the intermediate unit is more likely to be the operative factor in the transition from nationalism to internationalism.

The same caution must be applied to schemes of world-wide economic organization. The protest against nationalism will certainly not find expression in a return to the aristocratic cosmopolitanism of the Enlightenment or to the *laissez-faire* individualism of the 19th century. The socialized nation of our third period cannot be spirited out of existence. The mercantilism which stood for " wealth for the nation, but wealth from which the majority of the nation must be excluded " is dead. But the *laissez-faire* individualism which purported to interpose no effective economic

unit between the individual at one end of the scale and the whole world at the other is equally gone beyond recall. The pursuit of "free competition", of an economic principle of all against all, inevitably tends to create those extreme inequalities and forms of exploitation which offend the social conscience and drive the less privileged to measures of self-defence, which in turn provoke corresponding counter-measures. By the end of the 19th century this process had led, as it was bound to lead, to the progressive development of combination at every level and in every part of the system, culminating after 1914 in the most powerful combination yet achieved — the modern socialized nation. Thus measures of national self-sufficiency and economic nationalism which seem to negate free competition are in another aspect its natural consequence. But a further stage has now been reached. What was created by a cumulative process of combination between individuals to protect themselves against the devastating consequences of unfettered economic individualism has become in its turn a threat to the security and well-being of the individual, and is itself subject to a new challenge and new process of change.

Yet it is abundantly clear that this change cannot consist in any mere reversal of existing trends. The explicit or implicit undertone of much current discussion encourages the belief that the whole course of economic evolution in the 20th century is an error to be retrieved by returning to the universalism of an idealized past. Such a view, which inspired a long series of abortive international conferences from Brussels in 1920 to Bretton Woods in 1944, is both false and sterile. The forces which produced the socialized nation are still operative; nor will its demands be abated. Indeed the fact that these demands can no longer be met within the national unit, and that the same forces are now at work to break its bounds, is perhaps the best hope for

THE PROSPECTS OF INTERNATIONALISM

the development of an international system in our fourth period. The just criticism of the economic nationalism of the period between the two wars should be directed not so much against the methods it has used — though some of them were merely restrictive and aggressive, others were the intelligent and necessary instruments of a first, faltering attempt to plan international trade — as against the narrowness and inappropriateness of the geographical limits within which these methods were employed. It was not that intermediate units of economic organization were not required, but that nations had ceased to be convenient, or even tolerable, units for this purpose. The answer to the socially and internationally disruptive tendencies inherent in the juxtaposition of a multitude of planned national economies is not an abandonment of planning, but a reinforcement of national by multi-national and international planning.

Recognition of the inadequacy of the national unit on the one hand and of a single comprehensive world unit on the other leads to the question of the shape and size of the requisite intermediate units of organization. Ideally this should beyond question be determined by the end in view. Different units are appropriate for different purposes — an international authority for rail or road transport will not cover the same area as an international authority for air transport. Different units are appropriate for the same purpose at different periods — one of the cardinal international problems of to-day is that what might have been workable economic or military units in the 18th and 19th centuries have become impracticable in the light of modern conditions of industrial production or military technique. Hence the scope and constitution of different authorities must, on severely practical grounds, be determined according to the purposes which they are required to serve, on the principle of what has come to be called “functional”

instead of national organization. Even before 1914 there were, among other examples, two international commissions controlling navigation on different sectors of the Danube, an international railway union for Europe, and a Latin monetary union. Between the two wars the technical organs of the League of Nations, though sometimes hampered by a fictitious universalism, and sometimes by the absence for irrelevant political reasons of members who could have contributed effectively to their work, did good service; in the nineteen-thirties international commodity controls became for the first time a salient feature in world economic organization. During the second world war a vast number of new functional international organizations have been created. Some of them fulfil purposes which will end with the war; others like those which control and allocate essential raw materials, food and shipping may well be carried on into the period of peace. Among the most remarkable of all these creations has been the Middle East Supply Centre which, starting as a clearing-house for the scanty supplies available for the civilian populations of the Middle East in the war crisis of 1940-41, has come to play a vital role in developing the economic life of some fourteen countries. Bodies like Unrra and the Food and Agriculture Organization established by the Hot Springs conference of 1943, which look forward to the period after hostilities, have been conceived on a universal basis. Nevertheless it is already clear that they will be effective only in so far as they create separate organs for specific purposes in different areas.

These organizations have certain common qualities which explain both their value and the resistance likely to be encountered by them. In the first place, they are international in the sense that, while they operate on national territories with the tacit or explicit consent of the national governments concerned, they are not organs of these govern-

THE PROSPECTS OF INTERNATIONALISM

ments and do not formally derive authority from them. Secondly, they are international not in the sense that they exercise any authority over national governments, but in the sense that they operate in a number of countries without regard to the divisions and distinctions between them. Thirdly, the nature of their authority is "non-political" in that it does not ostensibly affect the sovereign powers vested in the national governments. In all these respects they constitute a striking parallel with the financial and economic system of the 19th century, operated all over the world by the organs of an anonymous authority having no precisely defined status, but enjoying in virtue of its "non-political" services and its prestige the toleration and approval of the national governments. Nor should another parallel be overlooked. It would be simple to-day — as it would have been simple in the 19th century if anyone had thought it worth while — to point to the fictitious elements in the separation of non-political from political authority, and to demonstrate that political power, however disguised and diffused, is a presupposition that lies behind any authority, however non-political in name. Nevertheless the world to-day, like the world of the 19th century, may have to put up with a certain salutary make-believe if it can find no way of consciously and deliberately effecting an international separation of powers. In the national community the concentration of all authority in a single central organ means an intolerable and unmitigated totalitarianism: local loyalties, as well as loyalties to institutions, professions and groups must find their place in any healthy society. The international community if it is to flourish must admit something of the same multiplicity of authorities and diversity of loyalties.

The view of an eventual world union to which the application of these principles would lead has been set forth

by a recent American writer in terms which cannot be bettered :

Let us not, then, irritate national egoism or offend the pride of sovereignty by inaugurating the union with flourish of trumpets, impressive ceremonies, and pledges given and taken for all future time. All of the words, resolutions, pledges, binding treaties, and solemn covenants that might conceivably induce the nations of the world to cooperate for the creation of a new and better world were uttered after the last war. What is needed is something less edifying and more prosaic, something less noisy but more effective. The contemplated union, league, federation, or whatever it is to be, will have a better chance of success if it begins, so to speak, "unbeknownst to itself", if it begins without declaring, or even professing to know, what nations may ultimately belong to it, or what the precise rights and obligations of its members may turn out to be. It will have a better chance of success, in short, if it begins with the drafting of specific agreements between a few or many nations for dealing with specific problems, and the creation of whatever international commissions, boards, agencies, may seem best suited to dealing with the specific problem in hand. . . . Such a union would be less in the nature of a created mechanism than a developing organism. It would at any time be what it could be effectively used for doing, and would ultimately become, in form and procedure, what seemed best suited to accomplishing the ends desired — the promotion of the common interests of its members and the preservation of amity and peace among them. In so far as such a union succeeded in accomplishing these ends, it would imperceptibly acquire "power", and as it acquired power, nationalism would no doubt be imperceptibly abated and the independence of sovereign states imperceptibly curbed.¹

It must, however, be admitted that this idealistic view of a functional internationalism, based on the conception of international order as association not between nations as

¹ Carl Becker, *How New Will the Better World Be?* (1944), pp. 241-3.

such but between people and groups of different nations, and realized through an indefinite number of organizations cutting across national divisions and exercising authority for specific and limited purposes over individuals and functional groups, would be utopian if it failed to take account from the outset of the unsolved issue of power. Some organizations of recognized general utility like the International Postal Union or the Central Opium Board may indeed achieve a position almost independent of the distribution of power. But these will not by themselves carry us far. The social and economic system of the 19th century depended on the unspoken premise of British supremacy. The international agencies of the second world war were made effective by the joint will and combined power of the principal United Nations. Within what framework of power can a modern international order with its multiplicity of agencies operate? Where will the ultimate decisions be taken that establish or reject its authority? The dream of an international proletarian revolution has faded; and while prophecy may be hazardous, there are few signs at present of any new international group or combination of power splitting national units from within. On the other hand modern developments of power are, though from another standpoint, equally inimical to nationalism in the old sense. These developments, which must now be examined, will go far to determine the shape of the new international order.

Power in the International Order

Few positive forecasts about the shape of the world after the war can be made with any confidence. But two negative predictions may claim some degree of certainty. We shall not again see a Europe of twenty, and a world of more than sixty, "independent sovereign states", using the

term in its hitherto accepted sense ; nor shall we see in our time a single world authority as the final repository of power, political and economic, exercising supreme control over the affairs and destinies of mankind. The prospect ahead is a compromise — which, like other compromises, may in the event make either the best or the worst of both worlds — between the past confusion of a vast number of nations, great and small, jostling one another on a footing of formal independence and equality, and the well-knit world authority which may or may not be attainable in the future.

If these predictions are realized, the world will have to accommodate itself to the emergence of a few great multi-national units in which power will be mainly concentrated. Culturally, these units may best be called civilizations : there are distinctively British, American, Russian and Chinese civilizations, none of which stops short at national boundaries in the old sense. Economically, the term *Grossraum* invented by German geo-politicians seems the most appropriate. The Soviet Union is pre-eminently a *Grossraum*, the American continents are the potential *Grossraum* of the United States, though the term is less convenient as applied to the British Commonwealth of Nations or the sterling area which are oceanic rather than continental agglomerations. Militarily, the old and useful term “ zone of influence ” has been discredited and may well have become too weak to express the degree of strategic integration required ; but the United States has coined the convenient phrase “ hemisphere defence ” to cover the zone of influence defined by the Monroe Doctrine. These classifications and divisions are as yet ill-defined. It is difficult to say whether there is a European civilization and a European *Grossraum* or merely a number of separate and conflicting units. Eastern Asia, which Japan once dreamed of organizing as a *Grossraum* under the strange-sounding

title of the "co-prosperity sphere", remains fluid. As a civilization China is a closely knit and coherent unit; economically she is weak and depressed; militarily her power is still negligible. India in one sense is a multi-national civilization, in another sense a part of the British unit: her political thought, in particular, is a baffling amalgam of traditional Indian and modern English. In the western hemisphere an older Iberian civilization, still struggling to maintain its ties with Europe, flourishes within the orbit of the modern North American civilization which was itself originally an offshoot from the British unit.

The fact that these actual or prospective agglomerations of power have not yet fully crystallized in such a way as to divide the world between them in clearly defined regional groups provides perhaps the best hope for the future. There would be little cause for congratulation in a division of the world into a small number of large multi-national units exercising effective control over vast territories and practising in competition and conflict with one another a new imperialism which would be simply the old nationalism writ large and would almost certainly pave the way for more titanic and more devastating wars. But international security can ultimately be provided — as well as threatened — only by those who have power, that is to say, for the main part by units having the status, in the old-fashioned but expressive phrase, of "Great Powers". These are a small and perhaps diminishing number; and it is conceivable that, in a world whose social well-being and economic smooth working were adequately promoted by appropriate international organization, the experience of the 19th century might repeat itself and no special institution be required for the maintenance of peace and security, which could be settled by *ad hoc* discussion between the Great Powers from time to time. Two considerations, however, militate against such

a solution. In the first place, international security in the modern world is likely to demand the maintenance of some standing international forces made up of different national units; and such a system calls for an institutional framework. Secondly, regulation is required of the relations of great and small nations in a system of pooled security; common membership in a world organization is the right and convenient way of solving a problem which has been made more acute by historical jealousies than by its intrinsic difficulties.

In the 18th and 19th centuries the convention was well established that issues of war and peace, that is to say, the issues on which security turns, were discussed and decided exclusively by Great Powers. This exclusiveness was not normally resented by the smaller nations; for the counterpart was that, when Great Powers went to war, smaller nations were allowed to remain, subject to the observance of certain rules, in a condition of comfortable neutrality. By 1914 the developments of military technique and economic power had made this immunity of small nations precarious; and recognition of the changed situation inspired in most of them (Switzerland being a striking exception) a desire to make their voice heard in future on issues of peace and war. In the period between the two wars two alternatives seemed open to small countries: to revert to the old policy of unconditional neutrality, and to adhere to the new policy of "collective security", which meant coming to the aid of an attacked country against its attacker.¹ Unfortunately one alternative was as impracticable as the other. Unconditional neutrality was no longer available: the punctilious anxiety with which Holland and

¹ The difficulties of applying the criterion of "aggression" need not be discussed here, since they did not arise in 1939: even when this additional hurdle had not to be faced, the system proved unworkable.

THE PROSPECTS OF INTERNATIONALISM

Belgium, Norway and Denmark, Yugoslavia and Greece proclaimed their complete unconcern in the war did not save them from being invaded and occupied. On the other hand collective security was equally unworkable: not a single small country in Europe entered the war until it was itself attacked, not through any lack of wisdom or courage, but because any such step would have been both suicidal and completely purposeless. Small nations could no longer acquire security at the price of neutrality; nor could they make any serious contribution to a system of security based on national armed forces taking independent action to be decided on when war actually breaks out.¹

The two ways out offered to the smaller countries between the two wars — unconditional neutrality and collective security — have thus both been closed; ² and their survival as independent entities seems incompatible with the maintenance by all nations of wholly independent armed forces which refuse cooperation with those of other powers until a breach of the peace actually occurs. Fortunately the present war, which has thrown this dilemma into high relief and made it a burning issue, also provides the material for a solution. Among the armed forces of the United Nations the process of "mixing up" has been carried far; and on almost every front units of the smaller nations are fighting with those of the three major powers under a common command. In the same way such units may participate with those of Russia, Britain and the United States in the occupation of Germany. Whether this happens or not, the lines of communication of the occupying forces will pass

¹ The argument in this paragraph has been developed at greater length in E. H. Carr, *Conditions of Peace*, pp. 50-60.

² The statement may not be universally valid outside Europe; and in Europe itself the conventional "no man's land" of international strife, Switzerland, may remain immune. The prospects of safe neutrality for other neutrals of the second world war seem less encouraging.

through several countries ; and the principle of leased bases initiated during the war can be profitably continued after it. It is through such haphazard and empirical expedients, rather than through any calculated plan of organization, that we may hope to achieve some rough approximation to the conception of international power. Only in some such way can the smaller nations be enabled to make any effective contribution to a system of international security and to maintain their independence by willingly merging some of its attributes into the common pool.¹

Such a solution provides the only acceptable answer to the vexed question of national self-determination. As we have seen, the assertion of an alleged right of national self-determination was a development of the 19th century. The peace treaties of 1919 were the first large-scale attempt to readjust international frontiers on a principle independent of that of power. The attempt was in some respects faulty. The principle was not always equitably and impartially applied ; it was pushed to an extreme through the creation or recognition of impracticably small units ; and the assumption was too easily made that language was a test of national allegiance. But recent reactions against national self-deter-

¹ An American writer has recently defined the necessary cooperation of large and small nations for common security in terms of the "good neighbour" policy : "The good neighbour relationship is one in which small states and a great one in the same area of strategic security become allies in peace and in war. The great state provides protection which — the technology of modern war being what it is — no small state can provide for itself. The small state reciprocates : it provides strategic facilities needed for the common defence, and it uses its own sovereign powers to protect its great neighbour against infiltration, intrigue and espionage. . . . Small nations . . . can now assure their rights only by a general acceptance of the duties of the good neighbour policy. We must not, as many do, identify the rights of small nations with their right to have an 'independent' foreign policy, that is to say one which manipulates the balance of power among the great states" (W. Lippmann, *U.S. War Aims*, p. 84).

mination as a valid principle have been due not to these incidental shortcomings, but to the perception of its apparently radical incompatibility with security. Self-determination raised the issue of military security in the acute form of strategic frontiers. If frontiers were drawn so far as possible to meet the wishes of the populations concerned, they would fail to take account of strategic requirements; if they met strategic requirements, they would ignore the wishes of the inhabitants. The peace-makers of 1919 took on the whole a low view of strategic necessities. The demilitarization of the Rhineland was an awkward compromise, reluctantly adopted to appease French insistence. But the wheel has now come full circle. A healthy reaction in favour of the requirements of military security has provoked a correspondingly strong reaction against the principle of self-determination; and notwithstanding its somewhat guarded reaffirmation in the Atlantic Charter, many demands have been heard for its abandonment as the basis of any future territorial settlement. It is true that these specific demands have related mainly to enemy territory. But once the principle were accepted that military considerations were the primary factor in the determination of frontiers, its application could hardly in the long run be restricted to particular cases.

Two powerful arguments seem decisive against such a principle. The first is that there is no such thing as a strategic frontier valid as a permanent bulwark of defence. In 1919 the Rhine was regarded as a strategic frontier of the highest order; in the present war, owing to the use of airborne troops and engineering skill, even the greatest rivers have not proved very formidable obstacles; twenty years hence a river frontier may be strategically worthless. The developments of military technique, and especially of air power, are now so bewilderingly rapid that the impregnable

strategic frontier of to-day, obtained perhaps by flouting the known wishes of millions of people, is only too likely to prove the Maginot Line of to-morrow. The next war, if it is fought at all, will probably be fought in the main with airborne armies and with projectiles having a range of several hundred miles. The whole conception of strategic frontiers may, indeed, be obsolescent; at any rate they can no longer be regarded as a main bulwark of security. The second argument is of a different kind, but not less potent. Self-determination, though it cannot be applied in the meticulous detail aimed at by the peace-makers of 1919, is a principle of good government. Small units can enjoy it only within narrow limits. Larger units cannot enjoy it absolutely and unconditionally; for interdependence is now universal. But the limitations placed on it must be such as appeal to reason and common sense. A peace settlement which transferred tens of millions of people to foreign allegiance — or, worse still, deported them from their homes — in the illusory quest for strategic frontiers might be imposed in the heat of emotion at the end of a bitter and devastating war; but it would not be upheld in cold blood even by the generation that had fought the war, and still less by generations to come. Such a settlement would thus in the long run prove fatal to the security which it sought to achieve.

The issue from this dilemma can be found only through a solution which seeks to divorce international security and the power to maintain it from frontiers and the national sovereignty which they represent. Any international force which could not operate freely across national frontiers would be doomed to inaction. Any system of joint bases in different parts of the world, in which units of different nations may participate, will call for a right of passage across frontiers. If then we can envisage an international

THE PROSPECTS OF INTERNATIONALISM

order in which frontiers lose their military significance, a ready escape from the dilemma of self-determination is offered; for in the drawing up of national administrative frontiers there will be no case for overriding the wishes of the population, where these are clearly known and defined, on so-called security grounds. Once the military framework of international security is established, the fullest play can be given to these wishes in determining the number, functions and boundaries of the national units exercising authority within it.

This principle provides the only tolerable interpretation which can be placed in practice on the right of national self-determination. National self-determination can hardly hope to survive so long as it is interpreted in a way which nullifies security and limits economic well-being and economic opportunity. But the complexity of human relations fortunately makes it natural and imperative for human beings to combine for various purposes in a variety of groups of varying size and comprehensiveness; and this leaves abundant scope for the development of that community of national thought and feeling, of political and cultural tradition, which is the constructive side of nationalism. The existence of multi-national units of military and economic organization does not stand in the way of the maintenance, or indeed of the further extension, of national administrative and cultural units, thus encouraging a system of overlapping and interlocking loyalties which is in the last resort the sole alternative to sheer totalitarianism.

If, therefore, we seek to define the forms of power in the new international order, the picture we obtain is one of an international general staff, or series of international general staffs for different regions, operating under the general direction of a world security organization with national or joint forces in occupation of strategic bases

at key points. It goes without saying that such an organization could function only if the three Great Powers were in agreement to give it their approval and support. It is obvious that it would not in the last resort prevent war between the Great Powers themselves. But it is sheer illusion to suppose that any institution or organization, however perfectly conceived and planned, could achieve this;¹ and the habit of cooperation and common action by the Great Powers would undoubtedly tend to remove a predisposing cause of war between them. It is obvious, too, that such an organization would not be free from the danger of abuses of power. But it is of the essence of power, a defect inherent in its nature and inseparable from it, that it can be abused; and those who, in domestic or in international affairs, would reduce political authority to impotence for fear that power may be abused can offer no alternative to anarchy. The ultimate conditions which will make any international authority tolerable are, first, that it shall maintain order effectively and with reasonable impartiality, and, secondly, that the order it maintains shall serve to promote and protect a widely diffused social well-being. This leads us to an examination of the common principles and common purposes on which any international order must ultimately rest.

Principles and Purposes

Hitherto the discussion has turned on what may be called the mechanics of international power. But the exercise of authority can never be an end in itself. The settlement of 1919 was strongly influenced by the 19th-century doctrine

¹ "War among the founders of the universal society . . . cannot be prevented by the rules and procedures of the universal society. . . . The world organization cannot police the policemen" (W. Lippmann, *U.S. War Aims*, p. 161).

of the *laissez-faire* state. Those reared in this tradition were likely to take a limited and negative view of the functions of an international organization. Like the state itself, international authority was thought of primarily as something that prevented unnecessary violence and safeguarded the rights of property — a policeman wielding a truncheon in defence of international law and order ; its social and economic functions were subsidiary and optional. To-day the broader view of freedom involved in its extension from the political to the social and economic sphere calls also for a more positive and constructive view of international authority. The substitution of the " service state " for the " night-watchman state " means that, internationally also, the truncheon must be reinforced by the social agency and subordinated to it. The belief apparently held in some influential quarters that security can be maintained, and war averted, through a perpetual alliance for defence against future aggression from Germany or Japan (who would in the meanwhile, according to most proponents of this view, have been reduced to complete impotence) does not withstand serious examination. Any international order which seeks to conjure the spectre of war and win the allegiance of mankind will have in future to set before it some higher ideal than orderly stagnation. Its primary function will have to be not to maintain the international *status quo* or to defend the rights of nations, but to seek by active policies to improve the conditions of life of ordinary men and women in all countries. No international organization of power, whether it be called a " world security organization " or an " international police force " or by any other name, will prove durable unless it is felt to rest on certain common principles, and to pursue certain common purposes, worthy to command the assent and loyalty of men and women throughout the world.

No thinking man will seek to deny or underestimate the dangers that threaten a world whose fortunes are inevitably dominated by a diminishing number of increasingly powerful units — dangers inherent both in the marked divergences of tradition and outlook and of standards of living and in the potential clashes of interest between them. If, however, we hope — as we rightly do and can hope — to avert these dangers, we must neither seek merely to stabilize an existing situation by artificial measures of security, nor look into the past for our remedies. Taking into account the nature of these great units of power, we must enquire not so much what potential conflicts divide them, but what principles and what purposes they can develop in common. We must seek to build our international order on principles and on purposes which, because they conform to the principles and purposes of the leading powers, will be acceptable to them, and, because they promote the well-being and minister to the aspirations of men and women everywhere, can become the focus of wider loyalties. It is neither necessary nor in the first instance possible that these loyalties should in all cases be world-wide. Organizations for different purposes can be built up on different international groupings whose scope will vary with the functions they perform ; and this variety and multiplicity is one of the most important safeguards against the accumulation of exclusive powers and exclusive loyalties under the control of the great multinational units. But common principles and common purposes must be established and resolutely pursued ; for these alone can afford the underlying basis of unity which is a condition of international peace.

A modern Spanish writer has defined a nation as “ an invitation issued by one group of men to other human groups to carry out some enterprise in common ”, and has added that contemporary nationalism has failed because it

has become "a pretext to escape from the necessity of inventing something new, some great enterprise"¹ — in other words, because it has become an end in itself. An international order which exists merely to defend itself and is unmoved by the ambition to undertake "some enterprise in common" will quickly lose all reality and forfeit all respect. Nor is there serious doubt what the "great enterprise" of to-day should be. It cannot be defined in constitutional terms or expressed in constitutional forms; for it is on the issue of constitutional forms that the nations are most divided. Any project which demands unity on "democratic" or on "communist" lines (to use words both of which have lost something of their pristine clarity of definition) is doomed to failure. Not only is the rivalry between them strong, but there are large areas of the world, including most of Asia and much of Latin America, which seem as far removed from one as from the other. That government should be "popular" and should be broadly based on the consent of the governed is an accepted principle. But there is no general acceptance — perhaps less to-day than fifty years ago — of the claim of political democracy to provide by itself the only and self-sufficient expression of that consent. Nor are political rights and political principles the dominant preoccupation of the contemporary world. The statement often, and justly, made that the future of democracy depends on its ability to solve the problem of full employment illustrates the subordination of political to social and economic ends in the modern world. Internationalism, like nationalism, must become social.

The main unifying purpose in the contemporary world, or in those parts of it where effective power resides, is the common ideal of social justice latent in such slogans as "the

¹ Ortega y Gasset, *The Revolt of the Masses* (English trans., 1932), pp. 183, 197.

common man", "the worker and the peasant", "the submerged tenth" or "the minimum standard of living". Ill-defined though it is, and susceptible of innumerable divergencies of interpretation and application, social justice has assumed in the 20th century the international significance attaching in the previous century to the equally vague but equally powerful concepts of political liberty and political rights. Whereas, however, the political ideals of the 19th century, being attainable by and through the nation, strengthened its political authority and prestige, the national unit seems at best irrelevant to contemporary ideals of social justice and at worst recalcitrant to them. If we seek to analyse what is meant to-day by social justice, we shall find it composed of three main elements — equality of opportunity, "freedom from want" and, as the dynamic factor lending reality to both the other elements, "full employment".

The equality of opportunity which social justice demands is an equality between human beings. It is not merely independent of the demand for equality between nations which wrought havoc and confusion between the two wars, but may be irreconcilable with it; and it can be realized only in a world which rejects the principle of discrimination on grounds of nationality. It would be utopian to suppose that the rejection of the principle would everywhere and immediately lead to a rejection of the practice. Yet the large units of power which confront us in the modern world are not national in the traditional sense; and the kind of internationalism for which they stand at any rate constitutes a step forward from the old nationalism. Whatever differences of outlook and method divide the three Great Powers, they are all united in loyalty to one principle. In the British Commonwealth of Nations one may be an Englishman, Scot or Welshman, a Frenchman or Dutchman, in the United

THE PROSPECTS OF INTERNATIONALISM

States a German, Pole or Italian, in the Soviet Union a Lithuanian, a Moldavian or a Kazbek without finding any avenue of political and economic opportunity closed on that account, or any barrier placed on devotion to one's own language or national customs. In the Soviet Union the predominant emphasis is laid — except in the sphere of language and culture — not on the national rights of the Kazbek republic, but on the equality enjoyed by the Kazbek throughout the Union with the Uzbek or with the Great Russian.¹ The success of this policy is confirmed by a careful observer in the late nineteen-thirties, who reports that "there is such an absence of favour to particular nationalities, and such a constructive effort to make their equality real, that national jealousy and friction are diminished, though not yet eliminated".² In the United States full and equal rights are accorded to every citizen irrespective of national origin; but any tendency towards the growth or survival of national consciousness in particular groups is watched with anxiety and any step calculated to encourage it studiously avoided. Moreover, both in the Soviet Union and in the United States a conscious attempt is made, through educational and other channels, to substitute a wider allegiance, conceived in terms of common ideals, for narrower national or racial loyalties — to inculcate the virtues of a Soviet or an American "way of life"; and if the British way of life has been the subject of less positive indoctrination, few will doubt that some such conception, rather than

¹ Act 123 of the 1936 constitution is an emphatic enunciation of this right: "Equality of rights of citizens of the USSR, irrespective of their nationality or race, in all spheres of economic, state, cultural, social and political life, is an indefeasible law. Any direct or indirect restriction of the rights of, or, conversely, any establishment of direct or indirect privileges for, citizens on account of their race or nationality, as well as any advocacy of racial or national exclusiveness or hatred and contempt, is punishable by law."

² J. Maynard, *The Russian Peasant and Other Studies*, p. 400.

national loyalties in any narrower sense, is the unifying force which has held together a multi-national British Commonwealth of Nations.

It would be rash to deny that these multi-national agglomerations of power are subject to abuses and present dangers of their own — in particular, the danger that they may eventually develop a new imperialism which would be only the old nationalism writ large. Acton once maintained that “the combination of different nations in one state is as necessary a condition of civilized life as the combination of men in society”, and that “those states are substantially the most perfect which, like the British and Austrian Empires, include various distinct nationalities without oppressing them”.¹ Whether this view be accepted or not, a political unit based not on exclusiveness of nation or language but on shared ideals and aspirations of universal application may be thought to represent a decided advance over a political unit based simply on the cult of a nation, or even over a political unit like pre-1939 Yugoslavia or Poland, where it made all the difference in the world whether one was a Serb, Croat or Slovene, a Pole, Ukrainian or Lithuanian.² It would seem therefore that, whatever other forms of human intolerance may become prominent, the expansion of the power and influence of great multi-national units must encourage the spread of national toleration. The oft-quoted parallel of religion and nationalism would suggest that, just as the movement for religious toleration followed the devastating religious wars of the 16th and 17th centuries, so the movement for national toleration will spring — since there is no reason to suppose that mankind has lost the

¹ Acton, *The History of Freedom and Other Essays*, pp. 290, 298.

² It is fair, however, to recall examples of perfect equality between nations in smaller multi-national states, notably Switzerland, and of discrimination against coloured people in some parts of the British Commonwealth and in the United States.

will to survive — from the destructive 20th-century wars of nationalism. The shift in emphasis from the rights and well-being of the national group to the rights and well-being of the individual man and woman which we already see at work in the multi-national state, if it could now be transferred to the sphere of international organization, would mark the beginning of the end of the destructive phase of nationalism.

The second element in social justice — “ freedom from want ” — is more familiar, more concrete and requires less discussion. It could indeed be argued that freedom from want is often as easily attainable by suitable policies within the nation as by international cooperation. In some cases this is, broadly speaking, true. But just as the social conscience calls to-day for mitigation of extremes of wealth and poverty among classes within the nation, so it has begun to recognize the close juxtaposition of nations with widely divergent standards of living as a menace to peace and to seek mitigation of such conditions as one of the initial constructive tasks of an international order. On the other hand it would be utopian to seek the attainment of this goal through universal or uniform action and organization. The issue presents a striking illustration of the need for adapting social policies to social conditions. The ideal of freedom from want is universal. But the problems of its application to advanced regions with a relatively inelastic birth-rate will be different not merely in degree, but in kind, from those of its application to regions where population constantly presses on a marginal level of subsistence. No single issue reveals more starkly the underlying lack of homogeneity which blocks the way to realization of the ideal of world unity and imposes division and diversity of policy in the pursuit even of aims recognized as common to mankind.

The third element — full employment — holds a somewhat paradoxical place in the contemporary programme of social justice. In one sense it is not an end in itself, since employment is always employment for some purpose, and nothing is more barren than the notion that the cure for unemployment is to provide otherwise unwanted "public works". In another sense, however, full employment is the master key to social justice in the modern industrial state, the dynamic force which alone can cure the major social evils of our time; and for this reason the central place occupied by it in modern thought is fully justified. The dependence of freedom from want on full employment is immediate and obvious; for though the breakdown of the economic system has been more conspicuous on the side of distribution than on that of production, it remains true that the wide extension of higher standards of living can be made possible only by increased production, and that this in turn demands the full employment of all resources, human and material. But it is less commonly recognized that full employment is also a primary condition of that equality of opportunity between man and man which we have recognized as the first element of social justice. Unemployment or fear of unemployment has been the most fertile cause of exclusion and discrimination in the modern world. It has sharpened and barbed every restrictive instrument of economic and financial policy; it has dammed and severely restricted the flow of migration from country to country; it has intensified discrimination against minorities, often raising it to the pitch of organized persecution; it has closed almost every door to refugees. Unemployment has been the specific social scourge of the contemporary western world and takes a high place among the ultimate causes of the second world war. It will serve no purpose to inveigh against these evils if the condition which produced them is allowed to recur. Full

employment is the only solvent powerful enough to break down the static and restrictive policies which dominated western civilization before 1939 and enable the present generation to build a social and international order on new and firmer foundations of equality of opportunity and freedom from want.

There would be no insuperable difficulty in drawing up ambitious international plans to assure full employment throughout the world, though even such plans could not be uniform, since backward and undeveloped countries would inevitably appear in them as objects rather than as originators of policy. But as a matter of practical politics, the prospects of making effective provision for full employment by agreements or machinery of world-wide scope are slender. Diversities in technical and economic development, with the conflicts of interest which these create, are too great to permit of a completely homogeneous system; and it is a symptom of these diversities that agreement about ends is not matched by agreement about means. Here again we shall probably have to be content with systems of joint planning and organization between countries or groups of countries agreeing to pursue full employment policies in common, or to share in the economic development of backward areas; and such regional policies may correspond in part, though not necessarily or exclusively, with the multi-national groupings of power. The stability of the framework of international order will thus come to depend partly on the balance of forces between the Great Powers, and partly on the success of common policies directed towards the realization of equality of opportunity, of freedom from want and of full employment. It is an illusion to suppose that security for the individual or for the nation can be attained through the limited resources of the small or medium-sized nation-states or through the

NATIONALISM AND AFTER

untrammelled and independent action of national governments. It is equally an illusion to suppose that the demands of social justice can be attained through a return to the "free" international market economy of the 19th century. To achieve these results through an executive world authority planning, directing and controlling from a single centre remains a dream of visionaries. The best hope of achieving them in the next period lies in a balanced structure of international or multi-national groupings both for the maintenance of security and for the planned development of the economies of geographical areas and groups of nations. This seems the surest prospect of international advance open, at one of the crises of history, to a world bewildered by the turmoil of nationalism and war.

POSTSCRIPT

IN this pattern of the modern world, dominated by new concentrations of power in great groups of nations, but crossed with strands of common social and economic policy and woven loosely together in a system of pooled security, the position of Great Britain is unique, and not free from anxiety. By herself, Great Britain is no match for the other great multi-national units and, with a population about the decline steeply, might be well on the way to become a secondary power. Were this to happen, British policy would be faced by a fearful dilemma; it would have the choice of subordinating itself to the policy either of the Soviet Union or of the United States of America, or of attempting, as other secondary powers have done in the past, to play off the more powerful units against one another — with inevitably disastrous results. But if this is not to happen, Britain must fulfil two conditions.

In the first place, a considered policy of economic and social organization is required to bring about that marked increase of efficiency in the production and distribution of wealth which will alone enable Britain to retain a leading place in the affairs of the world and convince other nations of her ability to retain it; and it would be reckless to underestimate the opposition to this far-reaching readjustment which will come from traditional inertia as well as from vested interests. Secondly, British conceptions of international policy must be radically changed. In this field Britain has a great potential source of strength, not only in the reinforcement which the British Commonwealth of Nations brings to her position, but in the lesson that can be drawn from inter-Commonwealth relations. These do

not rest on treaties or on formal obligations; even the follies of the treaty-ridden period between the two wars left relations between members of the Commonwealth unaffected. The crucial lesson of the Commonwealth can now be given a wider application. In relations with members of the Commonwealth, with nations which had already before 1939 been drawn into the fraternity of the sterling area, and with other friendly nations which may in future be drawn into a close community of interest with them, Britain should proceed not by way of generalized international engagements or long-term mutual guarantees, but by way of agreements issuing in direct and specific common action, of military conventions involving joint planning by a common General Staff and of trade agreements which approximate more closely to commercial transactions than to international treaties in the time-honoured form. These are the international policies which, combined with industrial and social reconstruction at home, will entitle Britain not only to retain a leading position among the nations of the world, but to make a first and constructive contribution to the creation of a lasting international order.

Among the nations with whom Britain might perhaps establish closer relations of this kind are those of western Europe. The plight of western Europe is graver than that of Great Britain, and is in some respects tragic. In the first place, western Europe is the home of the "national" epoch from which the world is now emerging. It is organized on a basis whose military and economic foundations have been irrevocably sapped — the basis of independent nations, each tenaciously clinging to its own traditional civilization; and either the sudden downfall or the slow decay of a powerful and traditional form of organization which has been overtaken by events and rendered obsolete



POSTSCRIPT

is inevitably marked with tragedy. Secondly, western Europe, even if she can renew her vitality and escape from the thrall of traditions once glorious, but now stifling to fresh growth, still lacks the leadership and central focus of power which would be necessary to place her among the great multi-national civilizations of the "hemisphere" or *Grossraum* epoch. Both Italy and France have in the past laid some of the foundations of a common European civilization; but both abused their power and fell behind in the race. In the 19th century Germany developed some of the qualifications for the leadership of a modern industrial Europe; but Germany has irretrievably abused her power. As the second world war comes to its end the unprecedented position has arisen that the two European powers most able to influence the destinies of Europe — Russia and Britain — are situated at its eastern and western extremities and are not exclusively or primarily European powers at all.

The outlook remains, therefore, dark and uncertain. It is conceivable that a shattered Europe, rising above the national hatreds and conflicts of the past, may throw up from within a new and unifying leadership which would enable her to develop and hold a position independent of both Britain and Russia. But no such prospect is yet visible above the horizon; and failing this, it seems likely that the European nations will inevitably be drawn into closer relations with both Russia and Britain. There are already signs of such an association between Russia and the nations of eastern Europe. A natural corollary would be the establishment of more intimate links, couched in terms appropriate to the western tradition, between Britain and the nations of western Europe. Such links, military and economic rather than political in the narrower sense, would rest on a solid basis of common interest. The same problems of security are common to the whole region. Most

NATIONALISM AND AFTER

of them are faced with the same problems of economic readjustment arising from balance of payments in dislocation, a high degree of independence on foreign trade, and a developed industry working on imported raw materials. The same challenge of social justice will be encountered and accepted by them all ; and they may be united by the same desire to find an answer based on principles which diverge both from the Soviet ideology of state monopoly and from the American ideology of unrestricted competition. Several of them have vast dependent colonial territories, the greater part of the African continent being divided between them. Common economic planning, as well as joint military organization, will alone enable western Europe, Britain included, to confront the future with united strength and confidence. The pride and prejudice of ancient traditions, as well as the innate conservatism of those who refuse to believe that the past cannot return, stand in the way of such a course. But many old traditions will have to be discarded, and new ones created, before Europe and the world can recover their balance in the aftermath of the age of nationalism.

THE END

Printed in Great Britain by R. & R. CLARK, LIMITED, Edinburgh
